

as "congenital malformations of the brain" and "mental deficiency."

Critics have cited a number of reasons for the deliberate starving of these Chinese children. Many of the children admitted to the orphanages were abandoned because they were born disabled. In a country that has an official policy limiting families to one child, some couples abandon disabled children so that they can try again for a healthy child; others may do so to shift to the state a care-taking burden they are unable to bear.

In the Chinese orphanages, according to these critics, it is these disabled children who tend to be subjected to "summary resolution"—deliberately starved, not treated when they develop easily treatable medical conditions, sometimes medicated to keep them quiet as they starve, and confined to "dying rooms." Chinese orphanages realize significant income from adoptions of healthy babies by childless Western couples; disabled babies are not only unlikely candidates for adoption but also no less burdensome for their institutional caretakers than they would have been for the parents who abandoned them.

The parallels with the treatment of disabled children in German institutions during the Nazi era are haunting. Although the vast bulk of Nazi killing was, of course, eventually focused on Jews and became what we now know as the Holocaust, it was heralded, before the start of the Second World War, by the systematic, government-sponsored killing of children and adults who were disabled—a practice that continued after the war began. The killing methods, especially in the cases of children, often involved starvation and the administration of lethal doses of medications. In the cases of disabled adults, direct killing using gas was common—a method that, once refined, was used on a mass scale against Jews after the German armies rolled into Poland.

The German killing of disabled children and adults was justified on the grounds that these persons constituted "life unworthy of life." After 1934, mental hospitals were urged to neglect their patients. In 1935, Hitler was confident that a war would require healthy people, and that during a war it would be possible to easily eliminate the "incurably ill."

According to the reports provided by Human Rights Watch, the starved children in the Chinese orphanages look very much like the starved children in the German "Children's Specialty Institutions"; the Chinese institutions, too, administer sedatives to some children selected for death; they, too, use false diagnoses as coverups; they, too, cremate the remains of starved children; and they, too, employ physicians, many of whom probably tell themselves that the children dying under their care would have died anyway, and in any case are useless eaters in a country challenged by scarce resources.

It should be clear; even if the existence of the "dying rooms" in Chinese orphanages were confirmed, it would not amount to the Holocaust, or even a semblance of it. Unlike Nazi Germany, China has not developed a systematic racial ideology, particularly one that requires all members of certain groups to be killed because of ethnic origin. Chinese leaders, as contemptuous of human rights as they have been, have not promulgated any such ideology; nor is it known that they have promulgated national or regional programs aimed at killing disabled children.

But if the report by Human Rights Watch is correct, it seems clear that the general circumstances in China, including the lack of individual human rights, have enabled at least some Chinese orphanages to engage secretly in practices that parallel some of the practices, particularly death by starvation,

that were carried out by Nazi Germany against disabled children and adults.

If the Human Rights Watch report can be verified by international inspections, the parallels between the Chinese orphanages and the Nazi programs to kill disabled children are alarming. These parallels remind us that human beings, including physicians and other caregivers, are extraordinarily vulnerable to inhuman acts and extraordinarily capable of justifying their behavior on what they see as rational grounds. And they remind us that countries in which democratic institutions are forcibly forbidden and human rights systematically quashed are ones in which human life becomes, quite simply, expendable.

The experience of the Holocaust, and the world's silence in response to it, have taught us that we must never shut our ears to reports of evil acts. We must investigate such reports and respond vigorously if they are confirmed. We have an obligation to do that—to ourselves, to the most defenseless of our fellow human beings, and to memory.

CHINA THREATENS TAIWAN

HON. SHERROD BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1996

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, An editorial in the New York Times this morning reads "China Threatens Taiwan." My Taiwanese-American constituents are extremely concerned about this news. And so am I.

According to yesterday's New York Times, Beijing has redeployed forces from other parts of the country to the coastal areas facing Taiwan and set up new command structures for various kinds of military action against Taiwan. The article quotes a Chinese official as asserting that China could act militarily against Taiwan without fear of intervention by the United States because American leaders care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan. This statement can be interpreted as an indirect threat by China to use nuclear weapons against the United States.

This past July and August, China already carried out a series of surface-to-surface ballistic missiles, live artillery, and joint air and sea forces combat exercises in the seas 80 miles off the coast of Taiwan. And China now vows to hold more rounds of military exercises. Allegedly, the People's Liberation Army has prepared plans for a missile attack against Taiwan consisting of one conventional missile strike a day for 30 days. These strikes will take place just after this March's Presidential elections. The first democratic and direct Presidential elections in Taiwan's history.

Indeed, China has threatened to use force against Taiwan under various scenarios, including the election of a President who does not support unification with China, and second, a declaration of independence, even if that declaration is the outcome of a democratic process such as a plebiscite or democratic elections.

The United States must reject military bullying from Beijing. Not only that; in accordance with the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979, any threat to the peace and security of Taiwan is of grave concern to the United States. The act explicitly states that the United States is obliged to make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services in such

quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient defense capability. Article section 2(a)(5) of the act reads, and I quote, "It is the policy of the United States, to provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character."

Peace and stability in the Taiwan Straits is in the political, security, and economic interest of the United States. United States interests are served by supporting democracy abroad. It is therefore necessary that the U.S. reaffirms its safety and security commitment to the people of Taiwan.

The U.S. should declare that any attempt by China to threaten the peace and security of Taiwan is a threat to peace and security in the Pacific and a matter of grave concern to the United States.

The United States should call upon the President of the United States to review the defense needs of Taiwan, under the terms of the Taiwan Relations Act, and act accordingly.

The United States should reaffirm that it is the right of the people of Taiwan to determine the future status of Taiwan without any interference from China.

GARABED "CHUCK" HAYTAIAN TO RECEIVE AWARD

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 25, 1996

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Garabed "Chuck" Haytaian on an award he will receive later this month. Mr. Haytaian, the recently retired speaker of the New Jersey Assembly, will be honored on January 27 with the 1995 Humanitarian of the Year Award from the Warren County chapter of the Arc. The Arc is an organization devoted to serving individuals with developmental disabilities and Speaker Haytaian is being honored in recognition of his long commitment to that cause. I have known Chuck Haytaian for many years and know that this honor is well-deserved. I am extremely pleased to serve as cochair of this event.

Speaker Haytaian's extensive work on behalf of people with developmental disabilities was shown recently in his support of the human services bond issue of 1994, passed under his leadership as speaker. This vital piece of State legislation provided \$160 million for the creation of new housing for those challenged by developmental disabilities, and upgrading of existing housing. This initiative benefited 4,000 people on waiting lists for residential services, including 60 people on an emergency list in Warren County alone. This assistance for Warren County is of particular importance to me, as the county is part of my congressional district as well as Speaker Haytaian's former legislative district.

Speaker Haytaian has been a longtime member of the Arc, supporting its policies, programs and fundraising. His involvement has helped attract others, who have served the organization in positions ranging from volunteers to board members.

This award is the latest recognition of Speaker Haytaian's lifetime of public service. Having served as an elected Warren County Freeholder, he spent 15 years in the New Jersey Assembly, rising through successively